

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MARIA S. CARUSO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

12-cv-394-wmc

REID PAULMAN, JANE DOE, DENNIS
YAHNKE, JOHN DOE and
HOLLY OTT,

Defendants.

MARIA S. CARUSO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

12-cv-737-wmc

HOLLY OTT and HER ACCOMPLICES,

Defendants.

MARIA S. CARUSO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

12-cv-738-wmc

PUBLIC, DOCTORS and LAWYERS,

Defendants.

MARIA S. CARUSO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

12-cv-739-wmc

CULVERS CORPORATION and
FORWARD MANAGEMENT,

Defendants.

MARIA S. CARUSO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

CONGRESS and SENATE,

12-cv-740-wmc

Defendants.

Plaintiff Maria S. Caruso sought leave to file five lawsuits against one or more of her former landlords, unspecified members of the “public, doctors and lawyers,” as well as the United States Congress and Senate. On January 11, 2013, the court denied Caruso leave to proceed and dismissed all of the above-referenced cases after finding that her allegations failed to state an intelligible claim within this court’s jurisdiction. Caruso has filed a motion for reconsideration, which the court liberally construes as one seeking to alter or amend the judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).

To prevail on a Rule 59(e) motion to amend judgment, a party must “clearly establish” (1) that the court committed a manifest error of law or fact, or (2) that newly discovered evidence precluded entry of judgment. *Blue v. Hartford Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 698 F.3d 587, 598 (7th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Harrington v. City of Chicago*, 433 F.3d 542, 546 (7th Cir. 2006)). Caruso does not demonstrate that her cases were dismissed in error and she does not show that she is entitled to relief under Rule 59(e). It follows that her motion for reconsideration must be denied.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration filed by Maria Caruso is DENIED.

Entered this 12th day of February, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/
WILLIAM M. CONLEY
District Judge